REMARKS

The Examiner requires copies of publications authored or co-authored by applicants and which describe representing flow by displaying a positional change corresponding to a rate of change of a parameter. Applicants have not published on this topic other than the current application.

The Examiner requires publications relied upon to develop the disclosed subject matter. Any publication known to applicants has been previously cited in a 1449. None are believed to describe the invention. None were relied on for development.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over a combination of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and Kawaguchi, et al. (US 5,677,501). Claim 20 was rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kawaguchi, et al., and Yoshiya (JP 02-161934). Claims 5-16 and 18-19 were allowed. Claim 21 was objected to as allowable if amended into independent form. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-4, and 20, including independent claims 1 and 20.

Independent claim 1 recites determining a rate of change of a parameter as a function of a difference in time between first and second images associated with different times, the first and second images representing a scanned region of a patient; calculating a positional change in the parameter between the first and second images associated with different times, the positional change being displayed as a function the rate of change and being a function of the difference in time; and displaying the change in the parameter in the second image. Kawaguchi, et al. and Yoshiya do not disclose these limitations.

As noted by the Examiner, the Admitted Prior Art does not calculate a positional change in the parameter between images (Office Action, page 3). Instead, the Examiner relies on Kawaguchi, et al. However, like the Admitted Prior Art, Kawaguchi, et al. do not disclose this limitation.

Kawaguchi, et al. provide a flow display to replace a bar graph or numerical values (col. 1, lines 6-20). The magnitude and polarity of flow are detected from an input signal indicative of a physical quantity (col. 5, lines 2-4 and 17-28). The magnitude is a difference

between a reference value and the input signal (col. 5, lines 24-28). A small area display (col. 1, lines 61-65) includes a plurality (e.g., 12) of fixed display segments (Figure 2; and col. 5, lines 41-45). The rate of shift of lighting each display element and the direction of travel of the shift indicate the magnitude and polarity of flow (col. 6, lines 18-52). Kawaguchi, et al. calculate a difference between a current input signal and a reference value (col. 5, lines 24-28), and change the output image based on the magnitude and polarity. However, Kawaguchi, et al. do not calculate a positional change in the parameter between images. The output images are the end result. The images change based on the input, but a positional change in the parameter between images is not calculated.

Kawaguchi, et al. would not have been combined with the Admitted Prior Art to enhance flexibility. Kawaguchi, et al. rely on changing direction and/or changing speed of shift through adjacent fixed display elements to communicate flow. The Admitted Prior Art displays a 2D region that varies based on ultrasound return and color wheel mapping. These two display techniques would interfere with each other, so would not be used together.

Independent claim 20 recites a processor operable to generate an at least partially persistent pattern in each of at least two images representing a region of a patient, the persistent pattern shifted, in a second of the images as compared to a first of the images, as a function of flow direction, flow magnitude or combinations thereof in the first of the images, the processor operable to calculate a second pattern in the second of the images as a function of a first pattern in the first of images.

The Examiner cites Kawaguchi, et al. for this limitation, but Kawaguchi, et al. do not disclose the limitation. Kawaguchi, et al. shift their three bar pattern (See Figure 3) at a speed based on the magnitude of the input flow and in a direction based on the polarity of the input flow. Kawaguchi, et al. do not determine any shift using previous images, but instead have a mapped pattern to shift based on the input signal. The pattern is not shifted as a function of flow information in a first of the images.

Yoshiya, et al. is cited to show a medical imaging system and the images representing a region of the patient. However, it would not have been obvious to modify Kawaguchi, et al. in view of Yoshida, et al. Kawaguchi, et al. would not have been combined with Yoshiya, et al. to enhance flexibility. Kawaguchi, et al. rely on changing direction and/or changing speed of shift

AUG 2 2 2008

through adjacent fixed display elements to communicate flow. Yoshiya, et al. display a contour that varies in size, shape, and position (see Figures 4a and 4b). These two display techniques would interfere with each other, so would not be used together.

Dependent claims 2-4, 13-16, 18-19, and 21 depend from one of the independent claims above, so are allowable for the same reasons. Further limitations may patentably distinguish from the cited references, but are not further addressed herein for brevity.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks early allowance thereof. If for any reason, the Examiner is unable to allow the application but believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any issues, he is respectfully requested to call Craig Summerfield at (312) 321-4726.

PLEASE MAIL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Siemens Corporation
Customer No. 28524
Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

Respectfully submitted,

Rosa S. Kim, Reg. No. 39,728
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)
Telephone: 650-694-5330
Date: 8-22-08